DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 389 701 SP 036 360

AUTHOR Glanz, Jeffrey
TITLE A Step towards Enhancing the Field of Instructional Supervision: A Modest Proposal for a New Journal.
PUB DATE 5 Nov 95
NOTE 17p.; Paper presented at the Fall Meeting of the Council of Professors of Instructional Supervision (University Park, PA, November 5, 1995).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120) -- Historical Materials (060)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Educational History; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; Intellectual Disciplines; Professional Associations; *Scholarly Journals; Teacher Education; *Teacher Supervision
IDENTIFIERS Council of Professors of Instruction Supervision

ABSTRACT

This paper proposes that the Council of Professors of Instructional Supervision (COPIS) start a journal devoted to the study and practice of instructional supervision and examines the history of "The Journal of Educational Method" to support the contention that the proposed new journal could thrive. An opening section argues that the proposed journal would help to enhance the field's reputation, would enliven supervision as a field of study, and would provide an outlet for scholarship. There is a lack of journals in the field, and other related fields in education may not be able to support many more journals than they currently support. However, if supervision is broadly conceived as related to many contexts, with varied approaches, and if inclusivity is valued and encouraged, then varied outlets for dissemination and scholarship would be welcome and necessary. The section devoted to "The Journal of Educational Method" reviews the journal's history as well as the history of the organization that published it, the professional orientation of the journal, how scholars came together to start and run the journal, and organizational difficulties. This section also outlines the characteristics of this journal and presents a detailed outline for the proposed new journal and related organizational considerations. The conclusion expresses the hope that continued dialogue will eventuate in the debut and publication of a new journal devoted to instructional supervision. (Contains 26 references.) (JB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 389 701

A Step Towards Enhancing the Field of Instructional Supervision: A Modest Proposal for a New Journal

By

Jeffrey Glanz, Ed.D.
Kean College of New Jersey
Assistant Professor
Department of Instruction, Curriculum, and Administration
Willis Hall 109B

Address:
1000 Morris Ave.
Union, N. J. 07083

W/1-908-527-2397
H/1-781-761-5778
Fax/1-718-761-5778 *51
jglanz@turbo.kean.edu

Paper Presented at the Fall Meeting of the

Council of Professors of Instructional Supervision (COPIS)

November 5, 1995

at Pennsylvania State University
University Park, PA

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J Glanz

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)"

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

SP836360

A Step Towards Enhancing the Field of Instructional Supervision: A Modest Proposal for a New Journal

By

Jeffrey Glanz
Kean College of NJ

Introduction: The Case for a New Journal Devoted to the Study and Practice of Supervision

Dr. Shapiro's (1995) comments at the spring conference echoed some of the feelings that I suspect many COPIS members have had for some time. No longer merely content with gathering twice yearly to socialize and share a sense of remorse over the field's inconspicuous status within the educational milieu, several COPIS members believe that it is opportune to assume a more proactive stance in regard to the field's future. This paper is an attempt to stimulate dialogue on one particular proposal that can, I believe, enhance the field's repute at the same time fill a widely perceived need. The proposal offered here is to initiate a new journal that specifically addresses the fourth purpose of Article II in the Constitution of COPIS which is "to develop and publish manuscripts on current research, theory, and practice in supervision of instruction."

Although I will argue that a new journal will enliven supervision as a field of study by serving as an outlet for scholarship, this proposal should be viewed as merely one effort among many that are needed. Supervision is plagued by many intractable problems such as: ahistoricism, blurred boundaries, multiple purposes, absence of a theoretical framework to guide practice, conflicting theories, archaic methods, vestiges of authoritarian practices, eclecticism at its worst, a penchant for the practical, and unpopular acceptance (see, e.g., Alfonso & Firth, 1990; Anderson, 1982). Recently, I argued that "Without a well-defined and all-encompassing resuscitation effort that aims for consensus in purpose, definition, and vision for the future, supervision as a role and function will, at best, continue to wallow in mediocrity; remain subservient to the interests of administration, curriculum, and teaching; and in a worst case scenario, simply become inconsequential in the educational enterprise" (Glanz, 1995, p. 108). I don't think a new journal by itself will magically remove supervision from its quandary. But it's a start in the right direction. Hence, Professor Shapiro's (1995) call for action is not only welcomed, but timely and urgent.

Before I elaborate the details of the venture I support, allow me to make a point I cannot overemphasize; that is, if supervision is to achieve its professional due then a concerted effort by both practitioners and professors of supervision will be necessary. It's not a reform that will happen without each of us participating in meaningful ways. I am reminded of the reporter who interviewed a world famous economist about the future

of Poland's economy. When asked by the reporter if he thought Poland could regain its economic stability, the economist stated that he thought it was possible. "How then can it happen?" asked the reporter. The economist replied, "well, it can happen in one of two ways." "What ways?" queried the reporter. "It could happen magically or naturally!" responded the economist. "Well, what would be the natural way?" asked the reporter. "The natural way," explained the economist, "would be for a band of angels to descend from heaven and lift Poland out of poverty into a state of prosperity." Bewildered by this response, the reporter asked "if that's the natural way, what's the miraculous way?" "The miraculous way," explained the economist, "would be for the Poles to do it by themselves!" I think that remains our challenge today. The situation will not resolve itself without mindful attention and careful work by all of us who believe that supervision is an important function for promoting instructional excellence in schooling. Supervision as a specialized area of practice and study can reclaim and reassert itself. By promoting critical inquiry, reinventing the human dimension of supervision, and realizing the possibilities for imaginative and visionary educational leadership, supervision can become a vehicle for liberation, improvement, and change (Waite, 1995). The challenge is ours and ours alone.

Now that I've made what I hope was an empassioned, if not convincing, plea for a concerted involvement in furthering the interests of supervision, perhaps I can now attend to the chief purpose for presenting this paper and that is to suggest the import and feasibility of a new journal.

Some may query, "do we really need a new journal?" The fact remains that other than the Journal of Curriculum and Supervision, which some may argue has not met the expectations of those of us specializing in supervision, and Wingspan, there is no other journal singly devoted to the study of the theory and practice of supervision. How many of us have prepared a manuscript on supervision only to realize the limited availability of a journal that would eagerly consider its publication? The point here is simple: COPIS has indeed provided a forum for members to express and share their ideas and manuscripts, however, beyond the development stage COPIS does not provide a forum for publication that would receive national and perhaps international attention. Hence, a need for a journal.

The fact of the matter is that the field of curriculum has at least a half dozen journals that address issues and concerns directly related to curriculum (Short, 1995), while publication outlets for supervision are pitiful by comparison. The addition of a new journal will not only provide an outlet for those individuals already publishing in supervision, but will, I suspect, attract new scholars. In other words, some might argue that the field of supervision cannot sustain two or more journals due the paucity of papers written on supervision. However, if you follow the development of other specialities (e.g., curriculum, teacher education, etc.) you will find that the emergence of new publication outlets attracted and increased scholarship in the field. There is no reason to suspect that the same will not occur with the publication of a new journal singly devoted to the study and practice of supervision.

Now, let's take a look at what we mean by supervision because our view of supervision will help us answer 2 questions: Do we need a new journal? and is there enough scholarship to warrant a new journal?

If we narrowly conceive of supervision as only, for instance, dealing with inservice situations or only referring to a particular model of supervision to the neglect of other viable methods, then the complaint that exclusionary discourse dominates the field holds weight. Discourse in supervision prior to the merger that formed ASCD was sharp and focused, albeit narrow. One of the consequences of merger was to, in effect, broaden the purview of supervision as a professional practice and field of study. Up to now we, including myself, have viewed electicism with much regret because it led to charges that the field was beleaguered by conflicting and nebulous proposals thus exacerbating the field's vulnerability and lack of influence. However, conceiving of supervision today in the broadest sense doesn't necessarily have to be a deficit, but can be the field's greatest asset.

Although this warrants further analysis and is something I am personally exploring, suffice it to say, that supervision today can be characterized by eclectism, at its best. Let's look at the glass as half full, not half empty. Supervision if it is to remain responsive to a drastically changing and complex school system must employ diverse and versatile approaches. Inclusivity and an acceptance of diverse ideas about the theory and practice of supervision must dominate discourse in the field. Consequently, conflicting theories or models of supervision should be welcomed, not resisted.

Supervision should no longer represent a specialized function performed by select individuals, as it was during the first half of this century. Supervision can embody different theories or conceptions to influence practice. To think otherwise is to conceive of supervision in a narrow and provincial way. Seeking one all-encompassing definition for supervision, for example, is no longer viable. Supervision must assume a new character that allows for differing viewpoints and practices. There is no longer a "one best way of doing supervision."

Thus, supervision, in this light, can be conceived as that function which utilizes a wide array of strategies, methodologies, and approaches aimed at improving instruction and promoting educational leadership as well as change. Those concerned with supervision may then work on curriculum development, staff development, school-wide reform strategies, action research projects, and mentoring while at the same time may utilize directive, collaborative, or empowering methods. Supervision is supervision regardless of the context in which it is practiced (whether it be in preservice and/or inservice settings). Supervision as such doesn't become meaningless or lacking purpose. Rather, supervision is pliable enough to meet a wide range of instructional needs. Remaining responsive to diverse demands would be the field's greatest asset.

So is there enough scholarship to warrant a new journal? If supervision is narrowly conceived and based on exclusivity, then a new publication forum is probably not needed. However, if supervision is broadly conceived as related to many contexts, with varied approaches and if inclusivity is valued and encouraged, then varied outlets for dissemination of research and scholarship would indeed be welcomed and necessary.

Historical Precedence: The Journal of Educational Method

Having emphasized the importance of a new journal singly devoted to the study and practice of supervision, I would like to now establish a historical precedence for such a project and indicate that perhaps the current journal could, in fact, model itself after its predecessor in some ways. I will first present a brief historical overview of the Journal of Educational Method, the journal published by the Department of Supervisors and Directors of Instruction (which was the group of supervisors that eventually merged with the Society for Curriculum Study to form ASCD). Samples of the Journal of Educational Method will remind readers not only of the content, scope, and substance of the Journal but will remind us that a journal solely devoted to supervision can survive and flourish.

A Historical Overview

Supervision has always been about achieving "quality" schooling. Our meaning of "quality" has, of course, changed dramatically. Methods of supervision in the nineteenth century were, impressionistic and imprecise as they relied on visitation and inspection always seeking the flaw - to remove incompetent teachers. Hierarchical, evaluative, and misdirected as it was, supervisory practices in the nineteenth century gave way to what were considered more scientific methods. Supervisors as a distinct occupational group sought to gain legitimacy for their work in schools by developing "scientific rating scales" which would presumably remove capricious methods of supervision. Yet, as we know, their methods also attracted vociferous criticism (Glanz, in press).

Supervisors during the first three decades sought to find their niche by achieving a degree of recognition for their work by no longer viewing teachers as incompetent but by seeking to improve instruction employing more democratic, if not collaborative, methods of supervision. The drive to achieve a more professional basis for their work (which translated in attempts to achieve dominance as occupational members in schools as well as recognition for the import of their work) was buttressed by the forming of a new organization and journal. An examination of the history of this organization and journal indicates that supervision as a field and practice achieved significant prominence and contributed greatly toward the professional status of those concerned with the supervision of instruction.

* * * * * * * * * * * * *

OVERVIEW OF HISTORY OF AN ORGANIZATION AND A JOURNAL

* 1921 - birth of National Conference on Educational Method (NCEM)

* 1921 - debut of a new journal - The Journal of Educational Method (EM), James Hosic, editor

* 1928 - changed name to National Conference of Supervisors and Directors of Instruction (NCSDI)

* 1928 - 1st yearbook on supervision and continued till 1943!

* 1929 - became a dept. under NEA - Dept. of Supervisors and Directors of Instruction

*1929 - Society for Curriculum Study (SCS) formed; journal "News Bulletin" then the Curriculum Journal cont. publ. till 1935

* 1937 - Joint Publication The Changing Curriculum; merger plans initiated;

* 1939 - DSDI membership well over 2500; SCS 807

* 1943 - official date of merger - Dept. of Supervision and Curriculum Development (DSCD); Ruth Henderson 1st Pres, Alice Miel, VP, Hollis Caswell, Dir. Exec. Comm.; Oct. debut of Educational Leadership

* 1946 - name changed to ASCD

* * * * * * * * * * * * *

The professional orientation

Supervisors sought professional autonomy and development through the forming of a new organization and journal, the first of its kind devoted exclusively to supervision. Hosic (1921) lamented the fact that there was a dearth of literature in the field of supervision, while at the same time there was much written about administration. Hosic charged that there was a growing need for an organization dealing with the particular concerns related to supervisors and supervision. After all, continued Hosic, even the teachers had an organization in the Department of Classroom Teachers, founded in 1914. Hence, there followed the birth of the National Conference on Educational Method (NCEM). The Journal of Educational Method, in an editorial (1922) proclaimed "meanwhile, through every possible agency we shall do well to publish the fact that supervision is a distinct occupation in itself, worthy of life-long devotion and demanding peculiar training and fitness." An examination of the publications, statements, and activities of this new supervisory organization indicates the desire by supervisors to redefine and reconceptualize supervision as a professional enterprise incorporating "democratic" methods to improve instruction in the schools.

Focusing on method, it was thought, would enable supervisors to attain professional recognition. An editorial (1922) of The Journal of Educational Method stated that in order for supervision to be considered a professional field of study it must provide "rigorous preparation, maintain definite standards, and give unmeasured service." Unfortunately, continued the editorial, supervision at present lacks "methodological direction." In order to foster this direction, the editorial proclaimed that the NCEM "must publish the fact that supervision is a field of study in its own right possessing distinct method in its work in schools."

While the journal sought to promote supervision as a unique profession and supervisors as specially trained professionals, the evidence indicates that reality fell far short of expectation. Professional growth and development through special training and preparation were inadequate to say the least. Supervisors, prior to about 1930, were selected on the basis of a minimum of undergraduate and graduate preparation, success as classroom teachers, and skill in certain administrative duties. The special supervisor was selected by the building principal or assistant superintendent on the basis of presumed expertise in a particular subject. General supervisors and principals were selected by school superintendents based on "competence in teaching, theory of supervision, and the science of measurements," said Coburn (1919), superintendent from Michigan. In an extensive survey conducted by Gwynn (1913) in thirty-one of the largest cities in the United States it was found that the conditions for eligibility, qualifications, and appointment of supervisors were less than adequate. In a majority of cities surveyed, there existed no legal requirements or qualifications to be a supervisor. When stated in some cities, the legal requirements were vague and general. These requirements stated that the supervisor "'must hold a teacher's certificate,' or 'must be a practical educator.'" In most cases, "the judgment of the superintendent is depended upon to determine the eligibility of supervisors."

The subjective, non-scientific training of supervisors can be demonstrated by a reading of a book written by George C. Kyte (1931), professor of education and supervision at the University of Michigan. The book, widely used in "supervisor preparation courses," presents case studies describing problems that supervisors are likely to encounter. The student is asked to carefully read each case study and "solve the problem." The case study method was quite popular and considered effective in training supervisors. With little, if any, rigorous requirements for eligibility as a supervisor, however, supervisors quickly realized the importance of establishing more comprehensive programs for training recruits. A review of the literature after 1930 indicates more rigorous standards were established for supervisors. For example, after 1930 many states established certification programs for supervisors (Spears, 1953).

Supervisors never abandoned their dream of becoming accepted professionals within the school organization. One of the more prominent ways they hoped to accomplish their objective was to promote the idea that supervision was a "helping function," not an obtrusive or autocratic function. "Snoopervision" and "Whoopervision" were no longer considered acceptable supervisory behavior. Rather, the "supervisor" as a "helper" was the paradigm. Ethel Salisbury (1918), special supervisor in Minnesota, claimed that besides being "progressive, open minded, patient, . . . and sympathetic," supervisors were professionals who cultivated democracy and cooperativeness in their relations with teachers. Indeed, the promotion of democratic ideals was an dominant theme in supervision during this time.

Supervision tried to move away from bureaucratic practices, originating in the late nineteenth century, to a more democratic and cooperative function in order to attain a greater degree of professionalism. The principal vehicle for enhancing their goal of professionalization was the formation of a new organization, the National Conference on Educational Method (NCEM). Principally through their journal and related publications

(NCEM, 1928, 1929, 1930), supervisors demonstrated their desire to improve instruction and accentuate democratic role relationships in schools. It is curious to note that this newly formed organization, which attempted to promote the goals and objectives of supervisors in public schools and at the same time wanted to distinguish their work from administration, maintained a close affiliation with administrators and superintendents. In fact, the NCEM held its annual meeting under the auspices of the Department of Superintendence of the NEA.

In February 1928, the organization changed its name to the National Conference of Supervisors and Directors of Instruction. A number of prestigious educators contributed to the organization's first yearbook. Scholars like A. S. Barr of the University of Wisconsin, Orville Brim of Ohio State University, William H. Burton of the University of Chicago and L. J. Brueckner of the University of Minnesota added prestige and impetus to their drive toward greater professional acknowledgement. About a year and a half later, in July 1929, the supervisory organization once again changed its name by dropping "National Conference" from its title. Becoming part of the NEA, the organization was now called the Department of Supervisors and the Directors of Instruction. Membership consisted primarily of people in local school systems throughout the country as well as in state, departments of education. Perusal of the publications, statements, and activities of this association indicates a concerted effort to further the "professional orientation" of supervisors throughout the nation's schools (Van Til, 1986).

The Context for the Joint Effort

In 1929, a group of college professors, under the leadership of Henry Harap, then of Western Reserve University, banded together to form the National Society of Curriculum Workers. Three years later, after a merger with a public school curriculum group, chaired by Walter Cocking, then professor of education at George Peabody College, the new association was called the Society for Curriculum Study (1932).

"The purpose of the Society," according to a "News Bulletin" published in 1935, "is to enable those interested in curriculum making to be of mutual help to each other, and to advance the movement of thorough and progressive curriculum revision." The Society was made up of the following types of people: "curriculum directors, administrative officers in charge of curriculum making, supervisory officers in charge of curriculum making, special or general consultants in curriculum revision, authors or investigators in curriculum making, and instructors in curriculum making" (Society for Curriculum Study, 1935). It was not until a year later that the Society included teachers in their organization. The Society was composed of a rather small and selected membership. At the time that the Curriculum Journal began publication in 1935, the Society's membership was 682. The highest membership the Society reached was 807 in 1939. The leaders of the Society were described by Saylor (1976) as "liberal in point of view on educational matters and probably to a considerable extent in political, economic, and social issues." "They were dynamic persons," continued Saylor, "many of whom were actively engaged in curriculum planning."

Unlike the Department of Supervisors and Directors of Instruction, the Society for Curriculum Study did not publish yearbooks. They did publish mimeographed news bulletins from 1931 to 1935. The bulletin consisted of brief descriptions of the curricular activities of people like Cocking, Dale, Harap and Courtis. The bulletin functioned to coordinate the curricular interests of a wide variety of people by reporting on conferences, outstanding courses of study, and state curriculum projects. "I have just received the News Bulletin and once again let me say how important I think this publication is," stated Paul Hanna. "There must be a tremendous lot of curriculum work going on in the country and it ought to be reported in our News Bulletin" (Society for Curriculum Study, 1934) They also published a number of books on curriculum issues, the first appearing in 1935, entitled The Workbook. This was followed by: A Challenge to Secondary Education, in 1935; Integration: Its Meaning and Application, in 1937; The Changing Curriculum, 1937; Family Living in Our Schools, 1941; Consumer Education, 1942; and An Evaluation of Modern Education, 1942.

The Department of Supervisors and Directors of Instruction and the Society for Curriculum Study operated as two separate organizations with very little interaction between them. Educators for a long time considered curriculum and supervision as two unrelated and distinct functions. Each would engage in their own activities without considering the significant interrelationships involved in the planning of curriculum and the supervision of instruction. Yet, by the mid-thirties these apparently disjointed and unrelated groups formed an alliance. Although there was a growing awareness of the interconnectedness of both functions in promoting school improvement, the alliance was essentially based on a common effort "to establish a strong, viable, dynamic organization. . . ."

The Joint Effort

A committee was formed, for the first time, in 1936 to discuss many common issues that affected both supervisors and curriculum workers. There are number of reasons why the two organizations decided to undertake this joint effort. First, there was an awareness that a unified and powerful organization was needed to serve the best interests of curriculum making in the nation's schools. As separate groups, they realized their political clout would be minimal. A coalition would command more prestige and recognition. Second, both organizations had overlapping memberships, especially toward the end of the thirties. For example, Rudolph Lindquist of California was both president of the Department of Supervisors and Directors of Instruction and also an active member in the Society for Curriculum Study. Hollis Caswell was also chairman of the executive committee of the Society for Curriculum Study in 1936-37, and earlier served as the first vice-president of the supervisory group as well as a member of the Board of Directors from 1935 to the merger.

A third reason for the collaborative effort between the two associations was that these people really believed that in order to successfully carry out the instructional aspects of schooling a unified effort between supervisors and curriculum workers was needed. This was especially appealing given the climate at the time to promote "the good society" through "democratic schooling." It became evident that to talk about curricular change without considering matters involving school

governance, administrative programming, and other institutional variables that supervision attended to would be senseless and educationally unsound.

Fourth, both groups had rather obvious limitations. One group had a small and limited membership, although at first the Society wanted a select membership. The supervisory group had a considerable membership, but was unable to realize its professional objectives.

The joint effort resulted in the publication of The Changing Curriculum (1937).

Opposition to the Merger

Following this joint effort, a merger seemed inevitable. Despite voiced opposition to a merger there is every indication that this criticism was limited and quickly overlooked. Helen Heffernan of the California State Department of Education and active member in the Department of Supervisors and Directors of Instruction voiced her opposition by stating that the supervisory organization was the stronger of the two, due to a more substantial membership, and merger would not aid their efforts toward professionalism. In addition, Heffernan stated that "curriculum development and supervision seemed to be related but not identical functions. Both required a distinctive type of expertness . . . . I have never been enthusiastic about the 'big umbrella'" (Saylor, 1976). O.L. Davis, Jr. in a letter to the author recalled an interview with Heffernan who told him that she opposed the merger for two reasons: 1) that supervisors would have less influence in the new association than they enjoyed in the Department of Supervisors and Directors of Instruction; and 2) that the men of the Society for Curriculum Study would be more prominent than the women. Alice Miel, Professor Emeritus at Teachers College, Columbia University, prolific writer of both supervisory and curricular matters, and later president of the newly formed organization ASCD, in an interview with this author, concurred that an important reason for the conflict about merger centered on male-female relationships. The supervisory group, comprised of many special supervisors, feared that merger with the curriculum group, mostly male, would eventuate in a male dominated organization.

Regardless of these criticisms, merger was inevitable. For the most part, most supervisors and curriculum workers welcomed the merger. Many realized that the goal of professionalism which both groups hoped for could now be attained as a result of the merger. An editorial (1943) in the Curriculum Journal stated: "The editor feels somewhat like the parent who is about to give away a favorite child in marriage. He approves his going, but parts with him reluctantly." Thus, the merger took place. The new organization was called the Department of Supervision and Curriculum Development. Three years later, the name was changed to the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD).

Implications

With the forming of the ASCD, whose chief stated aim was to further the interests of curriculum and supervision, optimism prevailed among merger supporters who urged that a single, united, and vital national

organization would best serve to further instructional improvement. However, hope obscured reality as many leaders in the field of supervision charged that the new organization was not addressing important issues involving the supervision of instruction. For instance, Krajewski (1976), in an article appearing in Educational Leadership, attested to the neglect of supervision as a field of study. He called "for putting the 'S' back into ASCD". As a result of the lack of attention to supervision, as compared to curriculum issues, one might conclude that the field of supervision suffered greatly because of the merger. However, those concerned with supervision were not the only ones dissatisfied with the newly formed organization. Pointing out the ill-effects of the merger for curriculum discourse, Nelson and Singleton (1980) concluded that "[O]ur own simple analysis of the new journal indicates that curriculum as a field of endeavor suffered greatly because of the merger."

Clearly, the merger between the Department of Supervisors and Directors of Instruction and the Society for Curriculum Study to form the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development had unintended consequences for both specialties. Distinctions between the two functions became blurred. To talk about curriculum was to necessarily involve supervisory strategies. Supervision too became synonymous with curriculum work. Was a curriculum specialist principally involved in developing curriculum called a supervisor? Was a principal supervising a curriculum project called a curriculum specialist? Defining curriculum and supervision became increasingly problematic. A content analysis of the new journal, Educational Leadership, indicates that not only were boundaries between the two functions undefined but to talk about curriculum and supervision included a host of educational issues that had no direct linkage to supervision and curriculum.

As a result of the merger and consequences thereof, one might speculate what might have occurred had not the merger taken place. Although an exploration of these possibilities warrant further analysis, one might venture to suggest a scenario or two. First, the distinctions between supervision and curriculum would have been marked. Roles and responsibilities for practitioners would be demarcated and ambiguity minimized. One-to-one direct supervision, as Heffernan imagined, would have continued and defined supervision clearly, albeit perhaps controversially, as a process involving the transmittal of expert knowledge for purposes of improving instruction. Supervision as a function would have continued as an identifiable position within schools. Teachers would teach and supervisors would supervise. Supervisors would continue to mentor and coach teachers.

Second, the fields of curriculum and supervision as professional educational endeavors would have been legitimized. The fact of the matter is that prior to Educational Leadership, the Curriculum Journal was a viable forum for deliberation on various theoretical and practical issues. The Curriculum Journal served as a forum for the exchange of views on curriculum theory and development across the country. According to Nelson and Singleton (1980), the loss of the journal "may have retarded the field of curriculum much more than we realize." In addition, the fact that to this very day there is not a single journal devoted to the study and examination of issues specifically related to supervision is indicative of the

paucity and inattention to issues relevant to supervisors. Hence, the need for a new journal.

Characteristics of the Journal of Educational Method

Samples of the Journal are attached and I think a perusal of them is instructive.

Format

* Editorial - sets tone
* Keynote articles
* Letters to editors - opportunity for authors to dialogue
* Administrative notes - "To the Members"
* News from the Field
* Research in Review (articles, books, dissertations, documents)

Inclusive (supervisors at all levels, directors of curriculum and instruction, principals, curriculum specialists, superintendents, professors, students, etc.)

Developing and Sustaining a Journal

Some might agree that a new journal in supervision is needed and would welcomed, however, these individuals might assert that the existence of a new journal is not economically feasible. The publication of a new journal could be developed and sustained by the following efforts (These are merely suggestive - the task force will develop more concrete proposals):

1) Commence serious discussions about the nature and format of a new journal. COPIS and AERA's SIG, for instance, should sponsor forums to discuss the general feasibility of sponsoring such an effort. Committees of interested individuals could be formed with specific charges (e.g., fund-raising, goals and objectives, rallying support, etc.)

2) COPIS, I believe, should spearhead efforts to publish this new journal. Fund-raising is really the number one issue that needs our immediate attention. Donations from the membership should be solicited and discussion should ensue as to how additional funds could be accrued.

3) Garnering institutional support should be a major consideration as well. A committee should be formed to explore the possibility of soliciting institutional support for the new journal.

4) Discussions about the scope and format of the new journal are necessary.

5) A list of materials and supplies should be developed....

6) A board of directors and editorial staff should be formed

6) Solicitation of manuscripts....

7) Advertising....

A New Journal: Organizational Considerations, etc.

Suggestions:

1) Name of journal

A) Journal of Instructional Supervision

B) Journal of Educational Supervision

C) Journal of Issues and Perspectives in Supervision

D) Journal for Interdisciplinary Studies in Educational Supervision

E) Others?

2) Design for cover

3) Publication schedule - I suggest that the first two years of publication should have only two issues per year (published semiannually)

4) Editorial Staff should consist of:

A) One editor (preferably with prior experience as an editor; specific requirements need to be identified)
B) Two Associate Editors (Who also comprise editorial board)
C) One Managing Editor
D) One Book/Article/Dissertation Review Editor
E) Eight Editorial Board Members (including editor and two associates)
F) Twenty Consulting Editorial Board Members

5) Sponsoring agency or institution?

6) Publisher ?

7) Journal should be indexed and abstracted

8) Contents should include:

A) editorial comments

B) Feature Articles

C) Book Reviews

D) Letters to the editor

E) Contributors

F) etc.

9) Statement of purpose (Editorial Policy)

For example:

The Journal . . . is the official publication of the Council of Professors of Instructional Supervision (and the AERA's SIG on Instructional Supervision?), founded in 199_.

The purpose of the Journal . . . is to foster scholarly investigation and study of supervision from a variety of disciplines and perspectives. The Journal . . . intends to provide a forum for discussion of relevant issues and perspectives of supervision. The Journal . . . intends to publish original articles which include theoretical expositions, research studies (quantitative and qualitative) and proposals, and other material of an academic and professional nature.

Contributions to the Journal . . . are solicited from practitioners, professors, and other scholars interested in . . .

10) Information for Contributors:

Conclusion

It is hoped that this presentation can invoke continued dialogue that will eventuate in the debut and publication of a new journal devoted to instructional supervision. The new venture is not meant to supplant other outlets for publication, but merely to offer an alternative and additional journal for interested scholars and practitioners of instructional supervision to share their views and research. By providing a forum that fosters scholarly investigation and study of supervision, the new journal can certainly enhance our field's professional recognition and perhaps contribute to a "brighter" future for supervision.

REFERENCES

Alfonso R. J., & Firth, G. R. (1990). Supervision: Needed research. Journal of Curriculum and Supervision, 5, 181-188.

Anderson, R. H. (1982). Creating a future for supervision. In T. J. Sergiovanni (Ed.), Supervision of teaching (pp. 181-190). Washington, D.C.: ASCD.

The Changing Curriculum. Joint Committee on Curriculum. New York: D. Appleton-Century Company, 1937.

Coburn, W. G. (1919). Preparation of supervisory and administrative officers. National Educational Association Proceedings, 57, 250-253.

Editorial, (1922). Supervision as a profession. The Journal of Educational Method, I, 34.

Editorial, (1943). Hail and farewell. Curriculum Journal, XIV, 193-194.

Glanz, J. (1995). Exploring supervision history: An Invitation and agenda. Journal of Curriculum and Supervision, 10, 95-113.

Glanz, J. (in press). Histories, antecedents, and legacies: Constructing a history of school supervision. In G. R. Firth & E. Pajak (Eds.). New York: Macmillan.

Gwynn, J. M. (1913). The selection and tenure of office of assistant superintendents and supervisors. National Educational Association Proceedings, 51, 301-305.

Hosic, J. (1921). The Opening Meeting of the National Conference. The Journal of Educational Method, 1, 38-39.

Krajewski, R. J. (1976). Putting the 'S' back in ASCD. Educational Leadership, 33, 376.

Kyte, G. C. (1931). Problems in school supervision. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

National Conference on Educational Method. (1928). Educational supervision: A report of current views, investigations, and practices - First Yearbook. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University.

National Conference on Educational Method. (1929). Scientific method in supervision - Second Yearbook. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University.

National Conference of Supervisors and Directors of Instruction. (1930). Current problems of supervisors - Third Yearbook. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University.

Nelson, R., & Singleton, H. W. (1980, April). The merger of Curriculum Journal and Educational Method: Effects of the curriculum field. Paper presented at the meeting of the Society for the Study of Curriculum History.

Salisbury, E. I. (1918). Supervision. American School Board Journal, LVII, 18-23.

Saylor, G. (1976). The founding of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. (mimeographed), 10-22.

Shapiro, A. (1995). A proposal for the future of COPIS. Presentation at the spring conference of the Council of Professors of Instructional Supervision, San Francisco.

Short, E. C. (1995). A review of studies in the first 10 volumes of the Journal of Curriculum and Supervision. Journal of Curriculum and Supervision, 11, 87-105.

Society for Curriculum Study. (1932). News Bulletin, III.

Society for Curriculum Study. (1934). News Bulletin, V.

Society for Curriculum Study. (1935). News Bulletin, VI.

Spears, H. (1953). Improving the supervision of instruction. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall.

Van Til, W. (Ed.). (1986). ASCD in retrospect. Washington, D. C.: ASCD.

Waite, D. (1995). Rethinking instructional supervision: Notes on its language and culture. London: The Falmer Press.